

Claim 1 recites:

*Road test simulator comprising:  
four rollers, each of which has an irregular surface cover, and  
four asynchronous motors, each of which drives a respective one of the rollers;  
wherein the rollers each comprise a plurality of coating rows extending in axial direction  
along respective outer circumferences of the rollers.*

The grounds of rejection acknowledge that Polhemus does not teach asynchronous motors and an irregular surface/coating rows. With respect to the feature of irregular surface/coating rows, the grounds of rejection point to no teaching in the references themselves as to how this feature is disclosed, but conclude that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the-art at the time the invention was made to provide an irregular surface on a tire since it was known in the art that tires are manufactured with an irregular surface.

Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. First, Applicants believe that perhaps the features of claim 1 may have been misunderstood. Providing an irregular surface on a tire itself (as discussed by the grounds of rejection) bears no relationship to the claimed feature. The claimed feature is related to rollers having an irregular surface - not the tires themselves.

Second, Polhemus teaches away from the use of an irregular surface of the rollers. In the Polhemus simulator, unit 16 simulates a flat road surface for direct contact with rotating wheel 12 (see col. 2, lines 35-44, and also the description of the flat wheel moving wheel support surface at col. 1, line 45). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Should claim 1 not be allowable in view of the differences with the cited art, the Examiner is kindly requested to issue a non-Final Office Action discussing how this feature is disclosed in view of the discussion above relating to the misinterpretation of the claimed feature as being tires that have an irregular surface.

With respect to the feature of asynchronous motors, the grounds of rejection indicate that Knestel implies the teaching of asynchronous motors (citing col. 4 lines 65-67). Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use an asynchronous motor in the Polhemus simulator since Knestel actually teaches away from this feature. In particular, a synchronous motor is used in the Knestel system due to its advantages (according to Knestel) with respect to the complexity of the design of the Knestel system and its safety advantages (see col. 4, lines 62-67). Thus, if anything, Applicants submit that Knelstel would teach using a synchronous motor in the Polhemus simulator. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable for this reason as well.

Claims 2, 3 and 5-16 are allowable based on their dependence on claim 1, as well as their allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/618,768

Attorney No. Docket Q75545

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ronald Kimble  
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 12, 2005